



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/686,719	10/17/2003	Jong-Phil Lee	44663	8798
7590	03/11/2008		EXAMINER	
Peter L. Kendall Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P. Suite 600 1300 19th Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20036			LAI, MICHAEL C	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2157
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	03/11/2008 PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/686,719	LEE, JONG-PHIL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MICHAEL C. LAI	2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 November 2007.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 17 oct 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1.) Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2.) Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3.) Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is responsive to amendment filed on 11/21/2007.

Response to Amendment

The examiner has acknowledged the amended claims 1, 3-7 and 9-13.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
2. It is important to note that independent claims 1, and 9, dependent claims 10-11 are replete with intended use recitations. The claim does not require anything new in that the limitations are "adapted to", "configured to", "according to", etc. perform steps that practically any computer can be configured to perform. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. Applicant failed to specifically point out any further contentions and thus, failed to claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theimer (US 6,519,241B1, hereinafter Theimer), in view of Hauduc et al. (US 6,993,568 B1, hereinafter Hauduc).

Regarding claim 1, Theimer discloses a device for managing information data in a mobile IP-based mobile telephone, the device comprising:

an embedded web server, adapted to display a homepage of the mobile telephone on a web browser when linked to the mobile telephone through the web browser of a telecommunication system [FIG. 1 and col. 3, lines 26-48];

a CGI/ASP program of server driven by the embedded web server to generate a command to enable communication between the mobile telephone and the telecommunication system using the web browser, and to transmit a message confirming that data updated in the web browser has been updated in the mobile telephone to the web browser [col. 4, lines 16-26];

a homepage of the mobile telephone, adapted to display information management menus of the mobile telephone [col. 1, lines 34-44]; and

a memory, adapted to store data of the information management menus [col. 4, lines 8-13, storage medium 12].

Theimer discloses substantially all the limitations, but fails to specifically disclose a language pack storing at least one language so that the information management menus can be displayed in a selected language. However, Hauduc discloses the idea of using language packs that can convert the content of the Web pages into the desired language and render the translated content for the Web client [col. 2, lines 35-49]. Thus it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Theimer by incorporating Hauduc's idea for the purpose of providing the content of a Web application in the client's preferred language, thereby providing language localization for server-based applications.

Regarding claim 2, Theimer further discloses wherein said information management menus represent information of the mobile telephone [col. 1, lines 34-44].

5. Claims 3-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theimer (US 6,519,241B1, hereinafter Theimer), in view of Hauduc et al. (US 6,993,568 B1, hereinafter Hauduc), and further in view of Shi et al (US 7,032,003 B1, hereinafter Shi).

Regarding claim 3, Theimer and Hauduc disclose substantially all the limitations as described above, but fail to specifically disclose about the data synchronization method between the mobile telephone and the web browser. However Shi discloses a method to synchronize local data storage on a mobile phone with a web browser (claims 1-13). Thus it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Theimer and Hauduc by incorporating Shi's idea for the purpose of synchronizing the web browser with data on mobile phones, thereby providing an up-to-date and consistent system.

Claims 4-5 substantially incorporate all the limitations of claims 1-3. The reasons for the rejection of claims 1-3 apply to claims 4-5. Therefore claims 4-5 are rejected for substantially the same reasons.

Regarding claims 6-7, Theimer further discloses wherein said command includes a standard protocol for communication between the mobile telephone and the telecommunication system using the web browser [col. 4, lines 16-25].

Claim 8 is of the same scope as claim 2. It is rejected for the same reason as for claim 2.

Claims 9-14 are of the same scope as claims 3-8. They are rejected for the same reasons as for claims 3-8.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is reminded that in amending in response to a rejection of claims, the patentable novelty must be clearly shown in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited and the objection made. Applicant must show how the amendments avoid such references and objections. See 37 CFR 1.111(c).
7. Parry, US Patent Number 7,002,703 B2, has taught methods of using an embedded Web server on a printing device to automatically download desired web-based data from a remote Web site.

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael C. Lai whose telephone number is (571) 270-3236. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Michael C. Lai
25FEB2008

/Ario Etienne/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2157